

29 October 1972 (2130)

Dear Al,

Enclosed are three documents: a typed manuscript and two ~~marked~~ identically marked up texts of the agreement draft. This constitutes the first of the four projects Henry asked me to undertake yesterday.

Would you please have a girl type up my memo in a form suitable for submission. ~~to~~ To the typed-up memo should be attached the cleaner copy of the marked up draft text. ~~Would you~~ If it is finished in time, I can proof and sign the memo right after the 30 October WSA. Would you ~~also~~ please make ~~one~~ copy of the memo for me. Also would you please hold the "WORK COPY" of the marked up draft text for me in your safe. I do not want to take it out of the White House, for obvious reasons, but would like to have it when time and the course of events erase current security strictures.

Four ~~other~~ other points in connection with the memo and its attachment:

1) Please check the spelling of the Vietnamese term that should be used for "administrative structure". I think it is "hanh chinh", but the accurate spelling can be found in the note on this subject I

I checked
this am
"hanh
chinh"
is correct

30 Oct 72

(2)

gave you Saturday afternoon (28 Oct).
The term appears near the end of
para 5 of my covering memo and
on page 8 of the draft text.

2) Someone who knows what he is talking
about should take a careful look at the
second paragraph of Article 2 (page 3)
and make sure we are not making a
commitment on which we can not deliver.
My understanding -- which may well be
wrong -- is that the Mark 36 Destructors
were (a) sown at random (i.e., no one
knows precisely where each and every one
may be located) and (b) can not be deactivated.

3) A peripheral point, but an important one
to us. Does the language in the last sentence of
the current draft text's Article 5 appearing
near the top of page 5 -- "Advisers from
the above mentioned countries to all paramilitary
organizations and the police force [sic, you
really should have a final "s"] will also be
withdrawn within ~~the~~ the same period
of time" -- encompass our case officers
working with the GUN's police and
intelligence services? If so (as is probably
the case), we are not fighting the language,
but will certainly need to discuss the
situation and problems it creates.

(3)

4) Finally, I saw no plausible way to slip such language into the actual text; but it would certainly be helpful if when negotiating the agreement's final text we could somehow make it pointedly clear that Communist efforts to gain territory between the time of signing and moment of cease-fire implementation would be regarded by us as ~~very~~ unfriendly acts, very much against the spirit of these agreements and likely to have (say) a decidedly adverse effect on our receptivity to Communist claims for post-war assistance.

Henry has asked for three other projects. Their status is as follows: I will try to send him the "how could we make it a victory" paper sometime tomorrow (30 Oct). He will get the South Vietnam Action Check-list on Tuesday, 31 October. The suggested locations for ~~the~~ inspection teams will be down at about the same time. On the latter, even a cursory look at the problem makes it abundantly clear that if you want to monitor compliance with the agreement's non-reinforcement provisions, teams confined to South Vietnam will do you little good. There will simply have to be ICCS teams in Cambodia and Laos plus -- ideally -- a team in Vinh.

Regards,

